

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated August 4, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for speaking with the Applicant's representative about the outstanding Office Action.

The Examiner did not address claims 29-30 as newly added in Applicant's response dated June 21, 2006. Applicants believe that claims 29-30 are patentable, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-13, 15-16, and 18-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,711,613 (Ewing).

Applicant has previously asserted that the present claims are patentable over Ewing in a response dated June 21, 2006. In response to Applicant's prior response, the Examiner stated:

In the remarks applicant argues in [] substance that; A) Ewing do[es] not disclose providing geographic information that indicates a geographic location associated with the network appliances.

In response to A), Applicant's arguments are inconsistent with the claims since the claims are not directed to network appliances as argued by the applicant. Claimed subject matter not the specification is the measure of the invention.

Office Action dated 8/4/06, p. 16 (emphasis in original).

Applicant respectfully asserts that the claims of the present invention do not relate to **network appliances**, rather the claims relate to an **uninterruptible power supply** (UPS). Applicant's prior arguments were intended to point out that Ewing discusses **neither** providing geographic information relating to the UPS discussed in Ewing **nor** providing geographic information relating to the network appliances discussed in Ewing. The reference to "network appliances" were made only in discussing Ewing, not the Applicant's claims. Furthermore, Applicant never intended that "network appliance" be read into the claims. For example, in the prior response, Applicant stated:

The cited portions of Ewing, however, do not disclose providing geographic information that indicates a geographic location associated with the network appliances. **In contrast, independent claim 1 recites** a computer program product including instructions for causing a computer to, *inter alia*, provide geographic information associated with indicia of changes in power status that indicates a geographic location associated with **a UPS**. Thus, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Ewing.

Response filed by Applicant on 6/22/06, p. 9 (original emphasis omitted, new emphasis added).

In addition to the above, in response to the outstanding rejections of claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-13, 15-16, and 18-24, Applicant respectfully reasserts the remarks made in Applicant's June 21, 2006 response (attached hereto as Exhibit A) regarding the patentability of the present claims over the cited references.

Claim 25, which depends from independent claim 1, is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed with respect to independent claim 1 in Applicant's June 21, 2006 response.

Claim 26, which depends from independent claim 7, is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed with respect to independent claim 7 in Applicant's June 21, 2006 response.

Claim 27, which depends from independent claim 22, is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed with respect to independent claim 22 in Applicant's June 21, 2006 response.

Thus, for at least the reasons claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-13, 15-16, and 18-28 are patentable over Ewing.

35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections

Claims 4, 8, 14, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ewing in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,677,894 (Sheynblat).

Claim 4, which depends from independent claim 1, stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ewing in view of Sheynblat. The Examiner does not assert that Sheynblat makes up for the deficiencies noted above with respect to independent claim 1 from which dependent claim 4 depends. Thus, dependent claim 4 is

patentable for at least the same reasons discussed in Applicant's June 21, 2006 Response with respect to independent claim 1.

Claim 8, which depends from independent claim 7, stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ewing in view of Sheynblat. The Examiner does not assert that Sheynblat makes up for the deficiencies noted above with respect to independent claim 7 from which dependent claim 8 depends. Thus, dependent claim 8 is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed in Applicant's June 21, 2006 Response with respect to independent claim 7.

Claims 14 and 17, which depend from independent claim 13, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ewing in view of Sheynblat. The Examiner does not assert that Sheynblat makes up for the deficiencies noted above with respect to independent claim 13 from which dependent claims 14 and 17 depend. Thus, dependent claims 14 and 17 are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed in Applicant's June 21, 2006 Response with respect to independent claim 13.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, this application is believed to be in allowable condition, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If a telephone conversation with Applicant's representative would help expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (617) 542-6000.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 50-0311, Reference No. 18133-112. The

Director is further authorized to charge any required fee(s) under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.19, 1.20, and 1.21 to the abovementioned Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Shane Hunter", is written over a horizontal line.

Shane Hunter, Reg. No. 41,858

Kyle Turley, Reg. No. 57,197

Attorneys for Applicants

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS,

GLOVSKY AND POPEO, PC

One Financial Center

Boston, MA 02111

Tel.: (617) 542-6000

Fax: (617) 542-2241

Customer No. 30623

Date: January 31, 2007

TRA 2244371v.2

Exhibit A

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated January 10, 2006, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

Attorney docket number

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner update the attorney docket number associated with the instant case to: 18133-112.

35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-13, 15-16, and 18-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,711,613 (Ewing).

Claim 1 and associated dependent claims

Ewing does not teach, disclose, suggest, or make obvious a computer program product, as recited in claim 1, including instructions for causing a computer to provide geographic information that indicates a geographic location associated with a UPS. The Examiner cited col. 4, ll. 19-47, col. 5, l. 36 – col. 6, l. 51, and col. 8, l. 63 – col. 10, l. 48 as disclosing “provide geographic information associated with the indicia of changes in power 15 status that indicates a geographic location associated with the UPS.” (Office action dated 1/10/06, p. 4). The portions of Ewing cited by the Examiner discuss “providing power supply status and control in network nodes at geographically distant locations.” Col. 4, ll. 20-21. When a problem at a remote node is detected, an alarm is issued that identifies the problem by type and node address. *Id.*, col. 8, ll. 65-68. The cited portions of Ewing, however, do not disclose providing geographic information that indicates a geographic location associated with the network appliances. In contrast, independent claim 1 recites a computer program product including instructions for causing a computer to, *inter alia*, provide geographic information associated with indicia of changes in power status that indicates a geographic location associated with a UPS. Thus, for at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Ewing.

For at least the reasons stated above with respect to independent claim 1, dependent claims 2-3 and 5-6, which depend from independent claim 1, are patentable over Ewing.

Claim 7 and associated dependent claims

Ewing does not teach, disclose, suggest, or make obvious an apparatus, as recited in claim 7, that includes a processor configured to collect power-status data and associated geographic data received from the remote devices via a communication interface. As discussed above, Ewing discusses providing status information about UPSs located at geographically distant locations. Ewing, however, does not teach, suggest, disclose, or make obvious an apparatus including a processor configured to collect power-status data and associated geographic data received from remote devices, the geographic data indicating geographic locations associated with UPSs as recited by claim 7. Thus, for at least these reasons, claim 7 is patentable over Ewing.

For at least the reasons stated above with respect to independent claim 7, dependent claims 9-12, which depend from independent claim 7, are patentable over Ewing.

Claim 13 and associated dependent claims

Ewing does not teach, disclose, suggest, or make obvious a method, as does claim 13, including receiving, at a plurality of devices, geographic information indicating multiple geographic regions associated with the power-status data. As discussed above, Ewing discusses providing status information about UPSs located at geographically distant locations. Ewing, however, does not teach, suggest, disclose, or make obvious a method including receiving, at a plurality of devices, indicia of power status from multiple UPSs coupled to the devices, the indicia of power status including geographic information indicating multiple geographic regions associated with the power-status data, as does claim 13. Thus, for at least these reasons, independent claim 13 is patentable over Ewing.

For at least the reasons stated above with respect to independent claim 13, dependent claims 15-16 and 18-21, which depend from independent claim 13, are patentable over Ewing.

Claim 22 and associated dependent claims

Ewing does not teach, disclose, suggest, or make obvious a combination of a UPS and a device configured to provide geographic information associated with indicia of changes in power status that indicates a geographic location of the UPS. As discussed above, Ewing discusses providing status information about UPSs located at geographically distant locations. Ewing, however, does not teach, suggest, disclose, or make obvious a combination of a UPS and a device configured to provide geographic information associated with indicia of changes in power status that indicates a geographic location of the UPS, as does claim 22. Thus, for at least these reasons, independent claim 22 is patentable over Ewing.

For at least the reasons stated above with respect to independent claim 22, dependent claims 23-24, which depend from independent claim 22, are patentable over Ewing.

35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections

Claims 4, 8, 14, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ewing in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,677,894 (Sheynblat).

Claim 4, which depends from independent claim 1, stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ewing in view of Sheynblat. The Examiner does not assert that Sheynblat makes up for the deficiencies noted above with respect to independent claim 1 from which dependent claim 4 depends. Thus, dependent claim 4 is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 1.

Claim 8, which depends from independent claim 7, stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ewing in view of Sheynblat. The Examiner does not assert that Sheynblat makes up for the deficiencies noted above with respect to independent claim 7. Thus, dependent claim 8 is patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 7.

Claims 14 and 17, which depend from independent claim 13, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ewing in view of Sheynblat. The Examiner does not assert that Sheynblat makes up for the deficiencies noted above with

respect to independent claim 13. Thus, dependent claims 14 and 17 are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 13.

Additional claims

Claims 25-30 have been added. Applicants assert that no new matter has been introduced by claims 25-30. Applicants assert that claims 25-30 are patentable, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, this application is believed to be in allowable condition, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If a telephone conversation with Applicant's representative would help expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (617) 542-6000.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 50-0311, Reference No. 18133-112.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kyle Turley/

Shane H. Hunter, Reg. No. 41,858
Kyle Turley, Reg. No. 57,197
Attorneys for Applicants
MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS,
GLOVSKY AND POPEO, PC
One Financial Center
Boston, MA 02111
Tel.: (617) 542-6000
Fax: (617) 542-2241
Customer No. 30623

Date: June 21, 2006

TRA 2158436v.1